# Thero – A2 Neg Must Read Framework

## Counter-interps

### 1 justification

#### Counter-interp – the neg may concede the aff ethical framework only if the aff had only one ethical justification for their framework

#### Turns philosophical education – the 1AC mooted philosophical education from the start – they made it impossible to engage in an ethics debate since I had nothing to answer – it would be more productive to debate the contention than the standard

### Theoretical justification

#### Counter-interp – the neg may concede the aff ethical framework if the aff [read a justification for their framework based on a definition of a word in the resolution or why their framework is better to debate] or [defended only links to their advocacy]

#### Theory justifications turns all his arguments – I literally could not engage in the ethics debate without having to debate theory – two impacts

#### Reject the theory – his interp allows debaters to run mutually exhaustive shells in the same round – negs literally lose every debate on theory

#### Turns education arguments – you force debates about theory instead of either the topic or philosophy – that’s even worse than just debating substance since it’s at least educational.

### Generic

#### Counter-interp – the neg may concede the aff’s ethical framework

### Standards

#### 1. Quality of arguments: the NC will straight ref or engage framework depending on which option they have better arguments on, so under my interp there is always high-quality clash whereas under the aff’s the neg might just read a bad framework with little clash which turns their education standard

#### A) Outweighs on probability since a debater who wants to straight-ref will minimize framework engagement and kick in the NR which is even worse since it results in shallow engagement throughout the debate

#### B) Outweighs on strength of link – obviously both philosophy and topic education are both important even if one is slightly better than the other – but the worst possible outcome is reading low-quality arguments that prevent effective clash in either respect

#### 2. Strategic thinking: Forcing the neg to always read an NC destroys strategic decision-making since neg never has to consider whether to engage the framework. There is no way their interp can solve this back

### A2 Strat Skew

#### Turn – the alternative is the neg reading separate framework and turning the aff contention every round which is worse since turn ground is lower quality since debaters will pick frameworks that advantage their side, which allows them to spend less time on the NC contention and more on the framework debate

#### That exacerbates the time skew and makes it easier to win the framework on the neg to win the round

#### Unreciprocal since the aff has to answer turns to the aff and win framework, but the neg only has to win framework

#### 2. Turn – Have to debate framework and contention makes it harder to cross-apply and weigh arguments to deal with several positions at once

### A2 Phil ed

#### Their interp assumes extremes – my interp still allows for framework debate, and in the majority of situations the neg is incentivized to layer the debate and read framework anyways. This means aff has to prove the marginal benefits of increased framework debate outweigh my unique impacts.

#### Topical education outweighs: In the situations where the neg straight-refs, there’s significantly more topical discussion since all speech time is spent on that issue. This forces critical thinking since we must explore the reasons to perform an action and

#### Applied ethics: forces us to apply the ethical theory to real-world issues, equally if not more important than deciding what theory is true

#### This assumes the philosophy debate of LD is equivalent to actual philosophy education, but:

#### Turn: LD bastardizes ethics all the time – there is no way to accurately explore 800 page books in 45 minutes. This means we’re actively learning and reinforcing inaccurate versions of philosophies as a result of the activity.

#### Turn: LD promotes absolute rules since we can never consider others’ frameworks possible impacts. Philosophers never bite the bullet, so LD framework debate is bad for actual philosophy education.

#### Non-unique: Almost all philosophy education occurs out-of-round, when debaters make frameworks, write blocks, and read books. A round in which neg has never heard of the AC ethical theory is incredibly rare, so their interp has marginal benefits.